

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

LATIKA TANEJA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALINNE CINTRA FREITAS, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:22-cv-00702-TL

ORDER STRIKING EXTRANEOUS
BRIEFING

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' request to strike arguments relied on by Plaintiffs in their Motion for Partial Summary Judgement, which has spawned a significant amount of activity on the docket, including Plaintiffs' pending Motion for Leave to File a Surreply (Dkt. No. 55) and related briefing.

Pursuant to LCR 7(g), requests to strike material relied on by an opposing party on summary judgment must be included in responsive briefing to be considered with the underlying motion; separate motions to strike are not permitted. Limited surreply briefing is only allowed when the materials sought to be stricken are set out in the moving party's reply brief and the

1 surreply must be submitted pursuant to the procedures outlined in LCR 7(g). “Extraneous
2 argument or a surreply filed for any other reason will not be considered.” LCR 7(g).

3 In their response in opposition (Dkt. No. 41) to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary
4 Judgment (Dkt. No. 31), Defendants include a request to strike certain arguments made by
5 Plaintiffs on summary judgment. Plaintiffs’ reply briefing (Dkt. No. 46) includes a response to
6 Defendants’ request to strike their arguments. This is all the briefing allowed or required by the
7 Local Rules for the Court to rule on the request to strike. All subsequent briefing related to the
8 request to strike is “extraneous” and improperly filed. It will not be considered. The Court
9 therefore DIRECTS the Clerk to STRIKE Dkt. Nos. 51-53, 55-56, and 61-65. The Parties shall not
10 file any further briefing on the issue.

11 Dated this 28th day of June 2023.

12 
13

14 Marsha J. Pechman
15 United States Senior District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24